

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 31, 2005, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Claims 1-35 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 23, 26, 27, 29 and 32-35 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 2-6, 7, 8-22, 24, 25, 28, 30 and 31 remain in this application.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has objected to Claims 7 and 24 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would allow the claims if rewritten in independent form.

The Applicants have rewritten Claim 7 in independent form, including all the limitation of original base Claim 1 and dependent Claims 6 and 5. This rewritten Claim 7 is now presented as independent Claim 36.

The Applicants have rewritten Claim 24 in independent form, including all the limitations of original base Claim 1. Claims 2-6, 7, 8-22, 24, 25, 28, 30 and 31 have been amended to depend, either directly or indirectly from amended independent Claim 24.

Claims 17, 18, and 19 have been amended to recite the proper dependency from Claim 16. This amendment does not add new matter and is not related to patentability.

Applicants assert that Claims 2-22, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31 and 36 are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner formally allow these claims.

Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-6, 22, 25, 28, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 5-6, 22, 25, 28, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boyle et al., (2004/0015184). The Examiner asserts that Boyle et al. discloses the invention as claimed, noting figures 1-2, and 4.

The Applicants have cancelled Claim 1 without prejudice, and have rewritten objected Claim 24 in independent form. Claims 2, 5-6, 22, 25, 28, and 30-31 now depend directly or indirectly from allowable Claim 24 rendering the rejection of these claims

moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 2, 5-6, 22, 25, 28, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Boyle et al.

Rejection of Claim 1-6, 8-22, 25, 28, 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1-6, 8-22, 25, 28, 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyle et al., (2004/0015184) in view of Boylan et al. (2004/0267301), and further in view of Crank et al. (2004/0158275).

The Applicants have cancelled Claim 1 without prejudice, and have rewritten objected Claim 24 in independent form. Claims 2-6, 8-22, 25, 28, 30-31 now depend directly or indirectly from allowable Claim 24 rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 2-6, 8-22, 25, 28, 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present application is now fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain that may be addressed by a phone conversation, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

No additional fee is thought to be necessary to enter this Amendment and Response. If an additional fee is required, the Examiner is authorized to charge the Applicants' Deposit Account - Account Number 10-0750/CRD-5057/VJS.

Respectfully submitted,

/Vincent J. Serrao/

Vincent J. Serrao Reg. No. 47,072
Attorney for Applicants

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
732-524-1163
Dated: June 30, 2005